

Special Education Public Reporting Instrument Panel Legend FFY 2007 (SY 07-08)

Prepared by the Indiana Department of Education
Division of Student Learning
Office of Differentiated Learners

Explanation and Purpose of Public Reporting

The purpose of this document is to provide the reader with more detailed information as it pertains to the Special Education Indicator data results for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007 (School Year (SY) 2007-2008 (07-08)). The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is required to publicly report Special Education Indicator data, for each Local Educational Agency (LEA), for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 for FFY 2007 (SY 07-08). The reader is also encouraged to review through the guidance documents located on the IDOE website related to the Special Education Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System for more information (<http://www.doe.in.gov/exceptional/speced/monitoring.html>).

Listed below is a description of each of the required publicly reported Special Education Indicators, the data source used to collect the information from the LEA, and the measurable and rigorous target established by the IDOE during the development of its six-year State Performance Plan (SPP).

Special Education Indicator Monitoring Priority and Explanation

Indicator 1: *Percent of youth with IEPs¹ graduating from high school with a regular diploma. ~~compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma~~ **

Number represents percent of special education youth graduating with a regular diploma, based on State Board formula, in School Year 2007-2008.

Data source: Graduate Report (DOE-GR) and Special Education Report (DOE-SE)

Measurable and Rigorous Target: Special education graduation rate, with diploma, will be $\geq 75\%$.

¹ Individualized Education Program

* Although the measurement remained the same, the rate for special education youth was not compared to all youth, per direction of Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

Indicator 2: *Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. ~~compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school~~ **

Number represents percent of special education youth dropping out of school during the School Year 2007-2008.

Data source: Special Education Report (DOE-SE) and the Dropout and Mobility Report (DOE-DM)

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The drop-out rate for students with disabilities is $\leq 25\%$.

Indicator 3: *Participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments.*

A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP² objectives for progress for disability subgroup.

Did the local education agency make AYP in the disability subcategory for Fall 2007 assessment in Math?

Data source: DOE Center for Assessment

Did the local education agency make AYP in the disability subcategory for Fall 2007 assessment in Language Arts?

Data source: DOE Center for Assessment

Measurable and Rigorous Target: LEAs meeting AYP in special education sub-category $\geq 93\%$.

B. Participation rate for students with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.

Number represents percent of students with disabilities, grades 3-10, taking ISTEP+ and/or ISTAR, Fall 2006. Calculation based on the number of students with disabilities, grades 3-10, taking ISTEP and ISTAR divided by total number of students with disabilities, grades 3-10.

Data source: DOE Center for Assessment

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The rate of participation of students with disabilities in state-wide assessment is $\geq 95\%$.

C. Proficiency rate for students with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

Number represents percent of students with disabilities, grades 3–10 who passed ISTEP+ and/or ISTAR, Fall 2007. Calculation based on the number of students with disabilities in grades 3 – 10 passing ISTEP+ in addition to those passing ISTAR, divided by number of students with disabilities in grades 3 – 10.

Data source: DOE Center for Assessment

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The number of students with disabilities with reported proficiency on statewide and alternate assessment is $\geq 34\%$ for English/Language Arts and $\geq 40\%$ for mathematics.

² Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Indicator 4: *Rates of suspension and expulsion:*

- A. *Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.*

A statement of “Yes” indicates a local education agency that had significant discrepancy of the percent of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

Data source: CEEP³, IEM/CODA⁴, Expulsions and Suspensions Report (DOE-ES), and Special Education Report (DOE-SE).

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The percent of LEAs meeting the criteria for statistical significance as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year will be equal to/or less than 1.00%.

Indicator 5: *Percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21:*

- A. *Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day*

Percent of students with IEPs, age 6-21, who receive services in the general education classroom more than 79% of the instructional day.

Data source: Based on December 1, 2007 Child Count reported through IEM/CODA

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The percent of students with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% for the day is $\geq 60.38\%$.

- B. *Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day*

Percent of students with IEPs, age 6-21, who receive services in the general education classroom between 0% and 40% of the instructional day.

Data source: Based on December 1, 2007 Child Count reported through IEM/CODA

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The percent of students with disabilities removed from regular class greater than 60% of the instructional day is $\leq 15.29\%$.

- C. *Served in public or private school separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements*

Percent of students with disabilities, age 6-21, who receive services in public/private separate schools, residential placements, hospitals, or homebound.

Data source: Based on December 1, 2007 Child Count reported through IEM/CODA

Measurable and Rigorous Target: The percent of students with disabilities served in either public/private separate schools or in residential placements is $\leq 1.21\%$.

³ Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP)

⁴ Integrated Electronic Management/Computerized Data Project (IEM/CODA)

Indicator 8: *Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.*

Data represents the statewide average of parent responses from the FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) Parent Survey. (Please note: The IDOE has not provided LEA specific data in order to maintain anonymity of those LEAs surveyed.)

Data source: Spring 2008 Parent Survey

Measurable and Rigorous Target: 88.4% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement.

Indicator 9: *Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.*

Statement of “Yes” represents an LEA that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.

Data source: IEM/CODA, CEEP, Special Education Report (DOE-SE), and Student Test Number Report (DOE-STN). The IDOE defines *disproportionate representation (or disproportionality)* of racial and ethnic groups in special education & related services and in specific disability categories as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 and a risk index that is equal to or greater than the state average or a risk ratio less than 0.5 and a risk index less than half the state average in special education and related services, for two consecutive years that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurable and Rigorous Target: Percent of LEAs that report disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%.

Indicator 10: *Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.*

Statement of “Yes” represents a local education agency that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Data source: IEM/CODA, CEEP, Special Education Report (DOE-SE), and Student Test Number Report (DOE-STN). The IDOE defines *disproportionate representation (or disproportionality)* of racial and ethnic groups in special education & related services and in specific disability categories as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 and a risk index that is equal to or greater than the state average or a risk ratio less than 0.5 and a risk index less than half the state average in special education and related services, for two consecutive years that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurable and Rigorous Target: Percent of districts that report disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%.

Indicator 11⁴: *Percent of students with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).*

Number represents percent of total initial evaluations completed within 60 day timeline.
Data source: IEM/CODA

Measurable and Rigorous Target: 100% of all referrals processed within the prescribed state timeline.

Indicator 12: *Percent of students referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.*

Number represents percent of students referred by Part C, found eligible for Part B with an IEP developed and implemented prior to the third birthday.
Data source: IEM/CODA

Measurable and Rigorous Target: 100% of students referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Indicator 13: *Percent of youth aged 14 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.*

Number represents percentage of sampled students' who have a compliant Transition IEP.
Data source: LEA file review of a representative sample of Transition IEP for students 14 years of age or older

Measurable and Rigorous Target: 100% of IEPs for students with disabilities aged 14 and above include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

⁴ **Note:** Indicator 11 data scores for school corporations for FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) represent a compliance rate using a 60 day timeline. Revisions to Article 7 (Indiana State Special Education Law) changed this timeline from 60 days to 50 days, effective August 13, 2008.

Description of “N/A” and “ ** ” within the Public Reporting Data**

A notation of “N/A” means the Indicator is not applicable to the LEA. Example: Several of Indiana’s charter schools only serve students kindergarten through fifth grade, and therefore they do not serve 14 year old students. Thus, Indicator 13 would be noted as “N/A” for these charter schools.

A notation of “ **** ” means a number or percentage could not be designated to the local education agency. Examples:

- Indicator 1 – a notation of “ **** ” is given if the LEA did not graduate any special education students during the 2007-2008 school year.
- Indicator 3A – a notation of “ **** ” is given if an LEA’s students with disabilities population is too small within that given category to determine AYP status (i.e. did not meet minimum “n” size for calculation).
- Indicator 11 – a notation of “ **** ” is given if an LEA did not receive a request for initial education evaluations during the 2007-2008 school year.
- Indicator 12 – a notation of “ **** ” is given if an LEA did not have any students transitioning from Part C to Part B during the 2007-2008 school year.